DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 549 CS 504 708

AUTHOR Willett, Tom H.
TITLE Teacher Assessment and Nonverbal Communication: The State of the Arts.
PUB DATE Sep 84
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri (Springfield, MO, September 21-22, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Classroom Communication; *Evaluation Methods; Measurement Techniques; *Measures (Individuals); *Nonverbal Communication; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Speech Communication; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Communication Styles

ABSTRACT

Assuming that teacher effectiveness and nonverbal communication are interrelated, an analysis of nonverbal communication and teacher assessment of nonverbal action is appropriate. A review of the literature indicates that nonverbal behaviors may be examined by the impressionistic and the quantitative methods. Each of these methods generates information useful for teachers in examining their own communicative behavior. The impressionistic method uses a semantic differential scale that provides a means for assessing the general level of teacher nonverbal activity. The Mehrabian instrument (1972), for example, includes 18 bipolar adjective pairs such as happy-unhappy, bored-relaxed, aroused-unaroused, and dominant-submissive. The scales can provide not only student perceptions of the teacher's behavior, but also a teacher's self-perception of his or her behavior. The quantitative analysis relies on instruments that classify classroom teacher behaviors. The Love and Roderick instrument (1971), for example, was developed on the basis of two criteria: behaviors included in the instrument had to be exhibited by a majority of teachers regardless of grade level or subject area, and the behavior had to be singular in meaning in this culture, rather than a reflection of any individual style or personality. Both systems of analysis illustrate workable methods of identifying, reinforcing, and, if necessary, correcting teacher nonverbal behaviors. (Appendixes include examples of both methods of assessment.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249549

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SPEECH AND THEATRE ASSOCIATION
OF MISSOURI

TITLE: TEACHER ASSESSMENT AND
NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION:
THE STATE OF THE ARTS

Tom H. Willett
Professor of
Communication
William Jewell College
Liberty, Missouri 64068

STAM Convention
Springfield, Missouri
September, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom H. Willett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 108

INTRODUCTION

> In its much-publicized April 1983 report, A NATION AT RISK, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) states that in order to foster student achievment, "salary, promotion, tenure and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged and poor ones either improved or terminated." Since the commissions report, national attention has focused in more heavily than ever on models of teacher evaluation plans across the country. None has received more acclaim than the program in effect in the Ladue school district, 10 miles west of Saint Louis, Mo.
>
> (Burgess, Learning, September, 1984, 55)

> A Missouri law requiring schools to evaluate teachers, which was assailed by some when it was enacted, is being followed by area school districts with hardly a whisper of complaint.
>
> (Thompson, K.C. Star, August 6, 1984, 1A)

Teacher evaluation is quickly becoming an area of focus for administrations and teachers. The focus nationally as well as on the state and local bases has made teachers at all levels of education consider their own effectiveness in the classroom. The inherent question is no longer should evaluation occur, but rather how best may the evaluation occur. The state of the art is no longer a question should we or should we not have assessments but rather how can we best assess our own effectiveness.

Regional and national associations of higher education also continue systematically exploring the dynamics of teacher effectiveness. As educators in our own field know, seminars, short courses, and literature abound for improving the teaching and learning process. The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education recently announced, "the renewal of its continuing seminar on teaching effectiveness, with six sessions scheduled for the fall and spring semesters."

(KCRCHE Teaching Effectiveness Series, 1984-85)

Teacher effectiveness is clearly a concern and often a mandated concern for educators at all levels. This concern is predicated on one critical assumption. The assumption is that teacher effectiveness is related to an analysis, understanding and application of nonverbal communication.

The assumption is clear when one realizes that the classroom is quickly becoming a vanguard of research in nonverbal communication. Educators are now discovering that "the classroom is a veritable gold mine of non-verbal behavior which has been untapped by scientific probes" (Knapp, 1980, 18). Explorations reveal that research into student and teacher nonverbal motions can provide a useful tool for improving the learning process (Knapp, 1980; Bassett & Smythe, 1979; Kash & Borich, 1978; Nyquist & Booth, 1977; Archer & Akert, 1977; Purkey, 1970).

Because of (1) the trends regarding the public awareness of nonverbal communication and (2) its impact on the educational setting, an analysis of nonverbal communication and teacher assessment of nonverbal action is appropriate. The assumption that nonverbal communication and teacher effectiveness are interrelated is given further evidence. Indicative of this are the criteria suggested for use in performance based teacher evaluation in the state of Missouri. The criteria calls for demonstrating ability to communicate effectively with students and demonstrating positive interpersonal relations with students, parents/patrons and educational staff. The Liberty, Missouri public schools use a modified version of the state model. It critically asks if "the teacher is a good communicator utilizing effective verbal and nonverbal techniques" (Liberty Performance Evaluation for Teachers, 2). Widely acclaimed UCLA educator Madeline Hunter, in advocating a seven step approach to effective teaching, also notes the importance of nonverbal communication. She says that when "checking for understanding a teacher should not only pose appropriate questions but also develop an appropriate system of nonverbal signals to indicate approval or disapproval" (Noteworthy, MCREL, Winter 1982, 49-50). Teacher evaluations as encouraged in higher education and often, as mandated in our public schools are an integral part of the educational process. The remaining portion of the paper presents two systems of instructor evaluation for nonverbal communication. The systems draw on and are applicable to college as well as elementary and secondary educators.

TEACHER ASSESSMENT

> Many of the communication problems experienced by today's teachers are a result of...the inability to analyze their own communication behavior and insensitivity to nonverbal cues (Nyquist & Booth, January 1977, 14).

This section of the paper involves the presentation and explanation of two (2) means of assessing teacher nonverbal behaviors. The rationale for assessment results from a study that examined the nonverbal behaviors exhibited by two groups of college teachers, effective teachers and average teachers. On the basis of standardized teaching

evaluation reports, ten experienced instructors of a basic speech communication course at a large midwestern university were designated as either effective teachers (ET's) or as average teachers (AT's). Comparisons of the nonverbal activity between the two groups were drawn in terms of self-report, student assessment, and an observational system for categorizing files of nonverbal behaviors associated with effective and average teachers (Willett & Smythe, 1977).

Based on the results, suggestions are presented for assessing teacher nonverbal motions. An analysis of the literature indicates that nonverbal behaviors may be examined from two methodological perspectives-first, is the impressionistic method and second is the quantitative method. Each of the methods generate information useful for teachers in examining their own communication behavior. The subsequent explanation focuses on a brief description of a workable approach for both the impressionistic and quantitative methods.

Semantic Scales: An Impressionistic Method

This method of assessing the behaviors of teachers may be used as both a self-report measure as well as a measure of student impressions. A semantic differential for nonverbal behaviors (Mehrabian, 1972) can be used to explore the impressions of the instructor's nonverbal motions. Specifically, the semantic scales provide a means for assessing the general level of teacher nonverbal activity. The term "general level of teacher nonverbal activity" is viewed as a global impressionistic examination of the teachers' behaviors; the semantic scales are used to provide an index of those impressions.

The instrument includes 18 bipolar adjective pairs, rigorously developed over a series of studies (for details of scale development, see Mehrabian, 1972 and Appendix A). Scales included happy-unhappy, bored-relaxed, aroused-unaroused, and dominant-submissive. The Mehrabian instrument is chosen because of its flexibility and specificity. Moreover, these are the only scales applicable to various communication situations including the classroom setting (Mehrabian, personal communication, 1975).

As a validation step, the instrument was completed by 341 undergraduate students enrolled in a basic speech communication course at a large midwestern university. All students were asked to evaluate the nonverbal activity of their instructors. A factor analysis of their responses was completed on the scale date. On the basis of the factor analysis, five factors emerged: pleasantness, responsiveness, dominance, importance, and autonomy. Three of these factors were similar to those originally reported by Mehrabian (1972) specifically - pleasantness, responsiveness, and dominance.

These factors accounted for over 90% of the variance. The high percentage of variance was taken as sufficient indication of the stability of the instrument for analysis of teacher behavior. The scales can provide not only student perception of the teacher's behavior but also a teacher's self perception of his/her nonverbal motions. The comparative data produced from self and others can be an important step in reinforcing and directing a teacher's sensitivity to nonverbal communication. It should be noted that the scales require a mastery of language and meaning most useful for high school or college level students. Certainly the instrument, however, is appropriate for self-report/assessment by elementary and middle school teachers in addition to personnel assigned the role of educator.

A Category System: A Quantitative Method

Ekman and Friesen (1969) have defined nonverbal communication as "...any movement or position of the face and/or body: (p. 49) or Koch (1971) has stated, nonverbal behaviors are "...any message we send or receive outside of words" (p.231). These definitions are adequate but lack specificity. Love and Roderick's nonverbal categories (1971) operationalized teacher nonverbal behaviors (see Appendix B). After examining several nonverbal systems specifically designed for analysis of classroom teacher behaviors (Grant and Hennings, 1971; Amidon, 1971; Galloway, 1962; Civikly, 1973) the Love and Roderick categories were chosen. The strength of the system is in its simplicity, validity, and reliability.

The Love and Roderick instrument was developed on the basis of two criteria: behaviors included in the instrument had to be exhibited by a majority of teachers regardless of grade level or subject area, and the behavior had to be singular in meaning in this culture, rather than a reflection of any individual style or personality. Since Love and Roderick's initial development of the ten-category system was based on extensive observations of both elementary and secondary teachers covering a variety of subject matter areas, a potentially strong and valid instrument is indicated.

Reliability level for intercoder agreement using the Love-Roderick instrument is approximately .88 (Roderick, personal communication, 1975) and is relatively high when compared with other systems such as Civikly's (1973) nonverbal system. Moreover, the system is perhaps more flexible than others, in that it was not limited to a single population of teachers at a particular level of education.

On the basis of pilot investigations using videotapes of teacher performance and the development of a coder training manual, it was deemed necessary to modify the original instrument. For example, two categories comprised of virtually identical nonverbal moves were collapsed to form a single category labeled "Accepts or Praises Student Behavior."

Another category included on the original instrument (Ignores Student Behavior) lacked specific examples and proved too difficult to accurately identify so it was excluded from the system.

A ninth category was added to the Love and Roderick instrument and was identified as "personal motions." Bodily actions classified as teacher personal motions were those identified as having a noninstructional purpose (e.g., personal mannerisms of playing with hair, adjusting tie, scratching ear, or adjusting glasses). Even though the motions did not contribute directly to the learning process, they were still worthy of examination because of the potential negative influence mannerism can have (Monroe and Ehninger, 1974). Moreover, previous investigations have revealed that personal motions may constitute as much as 22% of the total moves exhibited by a teacher (Grant and Hennings, 1971). To ignore such a category seems to invite less than a complete analysis.

A pilot investigation was conducted in order to determine the effects of adjusting the initial category system. Eight student teachers of speech were videotaped. The collapsing of categories, and the addition of the personal motions category produced no negative reactions and appeared to enhance the validity and accuracy of the instrument. Feasibility of the modified Love-Roderick system appeared strong. The pilot investigation demonstrated the integrity and validity of the categories. Modifications posed no inherent problems for trained coders and reliability levels were higher as a result of the changes.

For the instructor wanting to use the modified Love & Roderick procedure, a videotape should be made of the teacher in the classroom setting. Then the procedure can be applied to the motions exhibited on the tape. The instructor can then have quantified data on the frequency and types of nonverbal behaviors used.

CONCLUSION

This paper is based on teachers' need for workable alternatives for assessing their own nonverbal behaviors. The semantic scales and category system illustrate workable methods of assessing teacher nonverbal motions. These methods can be used to identify, reinforce and if necessary correct behaviors. The essence of analyzing teacher behaviors is expressed by Frederick Jones, a psychologist at the University of Rochester when he concluded:

> There have always been teachers
> who could teach a classroom beautifully.

> But what they do has never been really systematized so that it can be taught and passed on from one group of teachers to another.
>
> It has always been regarded as an art - this teacher has just got it, he was born with it... There's a certain amount of resistance to the notion that excellent teaching is teachable, that it's not some art form passed down in lucky genes. (Jones, 1977, 40A)

The primary premise of good teaching rests on "a teacher's ability to interact with students" (Burgess, Learning, September 1984, p. 59). The interaction is largely interpersonal, and nonverbal communication plays a vital role in that interaction.

APPENDIX A

SEMANTIC SCALES
INSTRUCTIONS

Indicate your impression of the instructor as viewed via his/her nonverbal behaviors. Nonverbal behaviors should be regarded as any movement or position of the face and/or body, e.g., eye contact, facial expressions, posture, general body movement, gestures, etc. Indicate your impression of the instructor on the following scales; for example, if you feel that the instructor is well described by the word at one end of the scale, you should place an X as follows.

Happy ___X___:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unhappy

or

Happy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:___X___ Unhappy

If you feel that the teacher is quite closely described by the word at one end as opposed to the other, mark as follows:

Happy _____:___X___:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unhappy

or

Happy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:___X___:_____ Unhappy

If the teacher is only slightly described by the word, then mark as follows:

Happy _____:_____:___X___:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unhappy

or

Happy _____:_____:_____:_____:___X___:_____:_____ Unhappy

If you consider the instructor to be neutral on the scale, or if you feel the scale is completely irrelevant, then mark the middle space:

Happy _____:_____:_____:___X___:_____:_____:_____ Unhappy

Use the scales on the back of this sheet to indicate your impression of instructor you have in Speech 75. Be sure to mark every scale only one time.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Instructor's Name_____

SCALES

Happy	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Unhappy
Satisfied	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Unsatisfied
Annoyed	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Pleased
Jittery	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Dull
Calm	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Excited
Hopeful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Despairing
Wide Awake	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Sleepy
Autonomous	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Guided
Controlling	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Controlled
Awed	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Important
Stimulated	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Relaxed
Frenzied	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Sluggish
In Control	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Cared For
Melancholic	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Contented
Aroused	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Unaroused
Influential	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Influenced
Submissive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Dominant
Relaxed	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Bored

Use the space below to indicate anything you want to concerning your instructor's nonverbal behavior.

Appendix B

CATEGORY SYSTEM

Adapted from: LOVE-RODERICK NONVERBAL CATEGORIES AND SAMPLE TEACHER BEHAVIORS, Theory Into Practice, October 1971, 295-296.

1. Accepts or Praises Student Behavior
   Smiles, Affirmatively shakes head, pats student on the back, winks, places hand on shoulder or head of student, places finger and thumb together, claps, raises eyebrows and smiles, nods head affirmatively and smiles.

2. Displays Student Ideas
   Written comments on board, puts students' work on bulletin board, holds up paper, provides for nonverbal student demonstration.

3. Shows Interest in Student Behavior
   Establishes and maintains eye contact.

4. Moves to Facilitate Student-to-Student Interaction
   Physically moves into the position of group members, physically moves away from the group.

5. Gives Directions to Students
   Points with the hand, looks at specified area, employs predetermined signal (such as raising hands for students to stand up), extends arms forward and beckons with the hands, points to student for answers.

6. Shows Authority Toward Students
   Frowns, stares, raises eyebrows, taps foot, rolls book on the desk, negatively shakes head, walks or looks away from the deviant, snaps fingers.

7. Focuses Students' Attention on Important Points
   Uses pointer or finger, walks toward the person or object, taps on something, thrusts head forward, thrusts arm forward, employs a nonverbal movement with a verbal statement to give it emphasis, i.e., reinforces numerical aspects by showing that number of fingers.

8. Demonstrates and/or Illustrates
   Performs a physical skill, manipulates Materials and Media.

9. Personal Motions (note: this category is adapted from Grant & Hennings, The Teacher Moves: An Analysis of Nonverbal Activity)
   Teacher scratches cheek, rubs back or neck, plays with clothing, puts hands in pocket, paces, plays with glasses, folds hands or arms, leans against rostrum or wall, etc.

APPENDIX C

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education

Teaching Effectiveness Series

1984-85

KCRCHE announces the renewal of its continuing seminar on teaching effectiveness, with six sessions scheduled for the fall and spring semesters. 300 faculty members participated in the 1983-84 series, many attending all or nearly all of the meetings. We promise interesting presentations and lively discussions. Plan to join us as often as you can.

THE FIRST SESSION

- Will be Thursday, October 11, 1984
- Topic: Research on Teaching, Learning, and the Outcomes of Undergraduate Education
  Larry L. Rose, President, KCRCHE

SUBSEQUENT SESSIONS

- November 8, 1984: Self-Evaluation as a Means of Assessing Teaching
- December 6, 1984: Student Learning as a Focus for Teaching
- February 7, 1985: The Characteristics of Successful Teachers
- March 7, 1985: New Technologies at the Teacher's Disposal
- April 4, 1985: Toward More Human and Humane Teaching

ALL SESSIONS

- Will be held from 2:30 - 5:00 p.m.
- Will be held at Penn Valley Community College, Campus Center 502
- Are open to full-time and part-time teachers
- Are free to faculty from KCRCHE institutions

REGISTER BY RETURNING THE FORM BELOW

- We encourage registration for the entire series
- Mark your calendar now and protect the dates
- Campus parking, three-tier lot, enter from Broadway

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SEMINAR REGISTRATION

Please register me for the entire series ☐

Please register me for the following sessions:

October 11, 1984 ☐	February 7, 1985 ☐
November 8, 1984 ☐	March 7, 1985 ☐
December 6, 1984 ☐	April 4, 1985 ☐

KCRCHE - No charge
Non-KCRCHE - $35/session
Payment enclosed ☐

Return this form to:
Wanda Byrd
KCRCHE
912 E. 63rd
KCMO 64110

_____
Name (please print)

_____
Institution

REFERENCES

Amidon, Peggy. Nonverbal Interaction Analysis. Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Inc., 1971.

Archer, Dane & Akert, Robin. How Well Do You Read Body Language? Psychology Today, October 1977, 11, 68-69; 72; 119-120.

Bassett, Ronald and Smythe, Mary-Jeanette. Communication and Instruction. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Burgess, Charles, Close-Upon Merit Pay. Learning, September 1984, 55-60.

Civikly, Jean Marie. A description and experimental analysis of teacher nonverbal communication in the college classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.

Ekman, Paul & Friesen, Wallace. The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: categories, origins, usage and coding. Semiotica, 1969, 1, 49-98.

Galloway, Charles M. An exploratory study of observational procedures for determining teacher nonverbal communication. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1962.

Grant, Barbara & Hennings, Dorothy G. The Teacher Moves: An Analysis of Nonverbal Activities. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1971.

Jones, Frederick. School's Little Monsters Target of Psychologist. The Kansas City Star. December 11, 1977, 39A-40A.

Kash, Marilynn & Borich, Gary. Teacher Behavior and Pupil Self-concept. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.

Kansas City Regional Council For Higher Education. Teaching Effectiveness Series. 1984-85. (see Appendix C).

Knapp, Mark L. Essentials of Nonverbal Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1980.

Koch, Robert. The teacher and nonverbal communication. Theory into Practice, 1971, 10, 231-242.

Liberty Performance Evaluation For Teachers, Liberty, Missouri.

Love, Alice M., & Roderick, Jessie A. Teacher nonverbal communication. The development and field testing of an awareness unit. Theory into Practice, 1971, 10, 295-299.

Mehrabian, Albert. Nonverbal Communication. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972.

Mehrabian, Albert. Personal Communication, November, 1975.

Monroe, Alan, & Ehninger, Douglas. Principles and Types of Speech Communication. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974.

Noteworthy, McRel, The Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Winter, 1982.

Nyquist, Jody L. and Booth, James L. Instructional Communication: A Basic Course for Teachers. Communication Education, January 1977.

Purkey, William W. Self Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1970.

Roderick, Jessie A., Personal Communication, May 2, 1975.

Thompson, Torrance. Schools Now Amenable to Evaluations. The Kansas City Star, August 6, 1984.

Willett, Thomas H. A descriptive analysis of nonverbal behaviors of college teachers. A competitive paper presented to the Instructional Development Division, Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C. December 1977.